

Flux flow dissipation in superconductors with short coherence length

F. Guinea

*Instituto de Ciencia de Materiales (CSIC), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid,
E-28049 Madrid, Spain*

Yu. Pogorelov

*Departamento de Física de la Materia Condensada, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid,
E-28049 Madrid, Spain*

(Received)

In superconductors where the coherence length is comparable to the Fermi wavelength, the electronic levels within a vortex core are quantized, and separated by energies of the order of the superconducting gap. The absence of a continuum modifies significantly the energy dissipation due to the motion of vortices. At zero temperature, dissipation is suppressed, and the system shows non ohmic behavior. The I-V characteristics show two distinct regimes. Below a given electric field, I is strongly dependent on V. Flux flow resistivity also shows a marked dependence on temperature, and reaches conventional values near T_c .

Flux flow dissipation is ubiquitous in type-II superconductors. The standard explanation of this effect is that, when vortices move, part of the electrical current flows through the core [1,2] (see also [3]). The core region is assumed to be similar to a normal metal. Dissipation in the core is described by means of processes indistinguishable from those which take place within a normal metal (note also that at fields close to H_{c2} , or temperatures close to T_c , additional dissipation arises from quasiparticles everywhere in the system [4,5]).

The basic premise of this argument is that, inside the core, a quasicontinuum of bound states exists. The motion of the vortices with respect to the impurities in the lattice gives rise to transitions for any velocity or energy. This picture is supported by detailed calculations for the low lying states within a vortex core [6,7].

Most of the Cu based high- T_c superconductors have coherence lengths at zero temperature very short, comparable to the lattice constant and to the Fermi wavelength. In this regime, usual calculations for the states at the vortex core are not applicable. It has been argued that the states within the core should be quantized, and separated by energies comparable to the superconducting gap. Recent observations confirm this picture [8].

The standard models of flux flow resistivity do not describe microscopically the processes which give rise to dissipation, which are taken to be the same as in the normal state. In normal metals, there is a continuum of electron-hole excitations. The density of states of these modes is proportional to its energy. This assumption suffices to obtain ohmic dissipation due to impurity scattering [9,10].

In the absence of a continuum, this picture needs to be reformulated. We will assume, following the standard work on flux flow resistivity that, when vortices move, some current flows through their core. As in conventional superconductors, dissipation takes place through the excitation of transitions between states within the core. We study these processes in a frame of reference where the vortices are at rest, and lattice impurities are displaced towards them. We will consider impurity scattering only, although the scheme can easily be generalized to other kinds of disturbances. We assume that impurities are the most efficient mechanism at low temperatures. Initially, each impurity is described by the Fourier transform of the potential, $\sum_q V_q e^{i\vec{q}\vec{r}}$. In the moving frame of reference, the position of a given impurity with respect to a static vortex located at the origin is $\vec{r}(t) = \vec{r}_0 + \vec{v}t$, where $\vec{v}$ is the relative velocity of the impurities. Hence, the impurities give rise to a time dependent potential, $\sum_q V_q e^{i\vec{q}\vec{r}_0} e^{i\vec{v}\vec{q}t}$. Dissipation is due to transitions induced by this potential.

This picture is standard in the study of atom-solid collisions [11]. Commonly, the excitation spectrum of the material, where energy is dissipated, is described in terms of response functions. Using this picture for an homogeneous superconductor, we obtain that dissipation sets in when $\hbar q_{max} v_s = \Delta$, where Δ is the gap of the superconductor, q_{max} is the maximum wavevector for an excitation at low energies and v_s is the velocity of the superfluid. Setting the free electron value $q_{max} = 2k_F$, we recover the known result for the critical current in a superconductor, in the absence of a magnetic field [3].

A knowledge of the full response function of the Abrikosov vortex lattice requires lengthy and tedious calculations. We will consider first the collision of an impurity with a single vortex, and the transitions that ensue. In order to simplify the analysis, we will study a two dimensional version of the problem. The vortex defines the z axis. For very anisotropic superconductors, like many high- T_c materials, a 2D picture is fully appropriate. In general, core states give rise to bands along the z direction. Transitions are characterized by the

wavevectors, $k_z, k'_z \sim k_F$, of the states involved. If the impurity potential is sufficiently short range, we can ignore the dependence of the transition rates on these momenta. If we neglect as well the dispersion of these one dimensional subbands, and describe each of them by a typical energy, ϵ_i , the problem becomes again two dimensional. The analysis to be discussed below applies, with the only inclusion of a prefactor $k_F a_z$, where a_z is the range of the impurity potential along the z direction. In any case, the most dramatic deviations from standard flux flow dissipation will be shown to be originated by the existence of a sizeable energy gap within the vortex core. This is a general feature of superconductors with a short coherence length.

A simplified sketch of the impurity vortex collision is shown in the figure. Within second order perturbation theory, the matrix element of the impurity potential and the states involved in the transition are required. The quasiparticle states induced at the vortex core have a smooth envelope, with a characteristic localization length of the order of the coherence length of the superconductor, ξ , and rapidly varying oscillations, characterized by k_F^{-1} , where k_F is the Fermi wavevector [6,7,12]. Thus, the spatial dependence of these wavefunctions, within a plane normal to the vortex, is like $\Psi_i \sim \xi^{-1} e^{-|\vec{r}|/\xi} e^{ik_F r}$. In addition, Ψ shows an angular dependence. Its influence in dissipative processes, however, is much weaker than the modulations discussed above.

For convenience, we will assume that the range of the (2D) impurity potential is shorter than the length scales mentioned above. Then, we can neglect its q dependence, and write it as $\sum_q V a^2 e^{i\vec{q}\vec{r}}$, where V is the strength of the potential, and a is a length of the order of the range of the impurity potential. We focus on a single impurity, which follows a trajectory $\vec{r} = \vec{r}_0 + \vec{v}t$. The vortex is located at the origin of coordinates. The transition amplitude between two vortex states i, j , with an energy splitting $\epsilon_{i,j}$ is given, within second order perturbation theory, by:

$$A \sim \frac{V a^2}{\hbar \xi^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-|\vec{r}(t)|/\xi} e^{ik_F r(t)} e^{\frac{i\epsilon_{i,j} t}{\hbar}} dt \quad (1)$$

In terms of the transition amplitude A , the energy dissipation per unit time and per unit vortex length can be written as:

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial t} \sim \sum_{\epsilon_{i,j}} \epsilon_{i,j} n v \int |A(r_0)|^2 dr_0 \quad (2)$$

where the summation is over all intravortex transitions, and an integral over all impact parameters, r_0 , is required. This integral is cut off by the smallest separation, r_{min} , possible between the impurity and the vortex center, This distance is of the order of the lattice spacing, which we can take similar to k_F^{-1} . n is the (3D) impurity concentration.

The integral over time in eq. (1) is determined by times such that $t < t_{min} \hbar/\epsilon$, where we are assuming that t_{min} is the shortest time in the integrand. Its behavior, as function of r_0 shows two different regimes, depending on the value of $\hbar v/(\epsilon r_0)$. If $\hbar v/\epsilon \ll r_0$, the integral has an exponential dependence on $\epsilon/(\hbar v \min(k_F^{-1}, \xi, r_0))$. Due to the existence of a short distance cutoff in the integral over r_0 , this can be the relevant regime for superconductors with short coherence length, as discussed below. In that case, the energy dissipation can be written as:

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial t} \propto \sum_{\epsilon_{i,j}} \frac{n\hbar V^2 a^4 r_{min}^2 v^2}{\epsilon_{i,j}^2 \xi^4 \min(k_F^{-1}, \xi)^2} \exp \left[-\frac{\epsilon_{i,j} \min(k_F^{-1}, \xi, r_{min})}{\hbar v} \right] \quad (3)$$

It is worth noting that, on the other hand, equation (2) gives rise to the standard ohmic dissipation for a metallic density of excitations. For an extended, normal vortex core, we can replace the sum over possible transitions by an integral. The density of low energy excitations in a normal metal goes as $N(\epsilon) \sim \epsilon/E_F^2$. Inserting this expression in equation (2), we find that $\partial E/\partial t \sim v^2$, which leads to ohmic behavior.

Equations (2) and (3) give the energy dissipation due to a single vortex. The dissipation per unit volume can be obtained by multiplying by the (two dimensional) density of vortices, $\sim H/(H_{c2}\xi^2)$, where H is the applied field.

In order to relate the dissipation to the I-V characteristics of the material, we will assume that the voltage drop is due to the vortex motion [13]. Then, the electric field within the sample is $|\vec{E}| = v|\vec{H}|/c$. The dissipation per unit volume is given by $\sigma_{ff}|\vec{E}|^2$, where σ_{ff} is the flux flow conductivity.

To our knowledge, there are no direct measurements of the vortex velocity in a type-II superconductor. For magnetic and electric fields typical for high- T_c materials, $H \sim 1\text{T}$, $E \sim 1\text{V/cm}$, we find that $v/c \sim 10^{-6} - 10^{-5}$. This result implies that, when the lowest energy splitting within the vortex, $\epsilon \sim \Delta/(k_F\xi)$, is $\epsilon \sim \hbar v/r_{min} \sim 2\text{meV}$, the effects considered here become relevant (we are taking $r_{min} \sim 1\text{\AA}$). This value is below the estimated gap of high- T_c superconductors, $\Delta \sim 3 - 5k_B T_c$ (assuming conventional s-wave pairing). This estimate can be reduced for larger magnetic fields or smaller voltages.

The dependence of the transition rates on v , for sufficiently low values of v , is determined by the exponential in eq. (3). Expressing the dissipation as $\vec{j}\vec{E}$, and using the fact that $\vec{E} \propto \vec{v}$, we conclude that $I \propto \exp -(V_0/V)$, where V_0 is a threshold voltage. Its value is such that the local electric field is given by $E_0 \sim \epsilon r_{min} B/(\hbar c)$. For the parameters mentioned above, this field is 1 V/cm. For fields lower than this value, dissipative processes are strongly suppressed. Note that this effect should be more easily observable at high magnetic fields, as the velocities of the vortices are smaller, and the motion is less effective in inducing transitions. This decrease in the vortex velocities more than compensates the increase in the number of vortices induced by the magnetic field. Thus, flux flow dissipation, for a fixed voltage, should decrease with increasing magnetic field, in sharp contrast with the Bardeen-Stephen model [1].

The anomalous dissipation in superconductors with short coherence length can be masked by pinning effects. Pinning energies also show unconventional dependence on applied currents, magnetic fields and temperature in high- T_c materials. The effects reported here influence the flux dynamics mostly at low temperatures (short coherence lengths), which also enhance the pinning of vortices. High magnetic fields, on the other hand, reduce pinning, and require lower vortex velocities to generate a given voltage drop. Thus, we expect that the suppression of vortex viscosity will be most effective in modifying the properties of high- T_c superconductors at low temperatures and high magnetic fields.

In many situations, flux creep determines the magnetic properties. The dynamics of vortices are described in terms of an exponential dependence on an activation energy, and a characteristic frequency [14], which describes the motion of the vortex within each potential well. This frequency, when the motion of the vortices is overdamped, depends on

the viscosity. So far, its dependence on magnetic field and temperature has been neglected. The analysis reported here suggests that this prefactor can also have a strong dependence on fields and temperatures. As function of temperature, we expect a crossover from a high temperature regime, where the motion is overdamped, and this attempt frequency is determined by the viscosity alone, to a low temperature regime, where the viscosity is negligible, and the attempt frequency depends on the mass of the vortex.

Our results may help to explain anomalous effects in the ac response of high- T_c superconductors in magnetic fields [15]. The strong dependence of I on V , for low voltages, described above may help to explain a variety of experiments, which have been fitted to $I \sim V^\alpha$ laws, with $\alpha \gg 1$ [16]. The absence of dissipative mechanisms, at low temperatures and high magnetic fields may also suppress the magnetic relaxation rate [17]. Magnetic relaxation involves the exchange of energy from the magnetic field into thermal energy. Our estimates for the relevant vortex velocities are also very close to those of interest in the vortex tunneling regime [20]. A change in the dissipation mechanisms can induce drastic modifications in the tunneling rates, as they depend exponentially on the viscosity.

It is interesting to speculate with the behavior of a type II superconductor in the limit of very large energy splittings within the vortex cores. Then, conventional dissipative mechanisms are frozen out, and, in the absence of pinning centers, vortices will move without friction. The motion of vortices gives rise to time dependent magnetic fluxes and induced electric fields, as discussed above. Thus, a voltage drop across the superconductor will be generated. On the other hand, the absence of dissipation impedes the existence of currents. Unlike a superconductor without an applied magnetic field, such a system should be able to sustain a voltage drop, without induced currents. This unusual behavior, which closely resembles that of an insulator, will be masked by the existence of pinning, which can localize the vortices.

The analysis presented so far relies on the applicability of the BCS theory to superconductors where $\xi \sim k_F^{-1}$. The limit of a strongly coupled superconductor, however, loosely resembles an array of weakly coupled superconducting islands. In these systems, local superconductivity can appear at temperatures well above those where global coherence sets in. This is similar to the expected behavior of a strongly coupled superconductor, where preexisting pairs are supposed to exist above T_c . Dissipation at low temperatures in arrays of Josephson junctions is being studied extensively, both experimentally [18] and theoretically [19]. It seems confirmed that, in the absence of nonsuperconducting, resistive channels, dissipation is strongly reduced at low temperatures. This result can be understood on general grounds, since the superconducting system has no low energy excitations below the plasma frequency.

In conclusion, we have extended the standard theory of flux flow dissipation to superconductors where the level splittings, ϵ , between the states within the vortex core cannot be neglected ($\epsilon \sim \hbar v/\xi$, where v is the velocity of the vortices). In this regime, dissipation is strongly suppressed. The response of the superconductor is non-ohmic, and I shows a marked dependence on V . The resistance is anomalously large. At a given voltage, the system undergoes a crossover into a more conventional flux flow regime.

Simple estimates show that this analysis may be relevant to high- T_c superconductors, at sufficiently low temperatures, so that $k_F \xi(T) \sim 1$. The currents should be large enough, in order to avoid pinning effects. It would be desirable to explore this regime of temperatures,

magnetic fields and currents [21], in order to check the results outlined here.

This work has been partially supported by CICyT (grant MAT91-0905). We acknowledge illuminating discussions on collision induced transitions and dissipation with Prof. P. M. Echenique.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bardeen and M. J. Stephen, Phys. Rev. B **140**, 1197 (1965).
- [2] P. Nozières and W. F. Vinen, Philos. Mag. **14**, 667 (1966).
- [3] P. G. de Gennes, *Superconductivity of metals and alloys*, Addison Wesley, Reading, MA (1989).
- [4] A. Schmid, Physik Kondens. Mat. **5**, 302 (1966).
- [5] C. Caroli and K. Maki, Phys. Rev. **164**, 591 (1967).
- [6] C. Caroli, G. de Gennes and J. Matricon, Phys. Lett. **9**, 307 (1964); C. Caroli and J. Matricon, Phys. Kondens. Mater. **3**, 380 (1965).
- [7] F. Gygi and M. Schlüter, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 7609 (1991).
- [8] K. Karrai, E. J. Choi, F. Dunmore, S. Liu, H. D. Drew, Qi Li, D. B. Fenner, Y. D. Zhu and F. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 152 (1992).
- [9] N. W. Ashcroft and N. D. Mermin, *Solid State Physics*, Holt-Saunders, New York (1976).
- [10] F. Guinea, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 1269 (1984).
- [11] A. Arnau, P. M. Echenique and R. H. Ritchie, Nucl. Inst. and Methods, **B33**, 138 (1988).
- [12] Yu. Pogorelov, preprint.
- [13] See, for instance, Y. B. Kim and M. J. Stephen in *Superconductivity*, R. D. Parks ed., M. Dekker, New York (1969).
- [14] T. T. M. Palstra, B. Battlogg, R. B. van Dover, L. F. Schneemeyer and I. V. Waszczak, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 6621 (1990).
- [15] F. Zuo, M. B. Salamon, E. D. Bukowski, J. P. Rice and D. M. Ginsberg, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 6600 (1990); L. Fábregas, J. Fontcuberta, S. Piñol, C. J. van der Beek and P. H. Kes, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 15250 (1993).
- [16] E. Zeldov, N. M. Amer, G. Koren, A. Gupta, T. R. J. Gambino and M. W. Mc Elfresh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 3093 (1989). M. A. Crusellas, J. Fontcuberta and S. Piñol, Phys. Rev. B, in press.
- [17] G. T. Seidler, C. S. Carrillo, T. F. Rosenbaum, U. Welp, G. W. Crabtree and V. M. Vinokur, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2814 (1993).
- [18] H. S. J. van der Zant, F. C. Fritschy, T. P. Orlando and J. E. Mooij, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 295 (1993).
- [19] U. Geigenmüller, C. J. Lobb and C. B. Whan, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 348 (1993); U. Eckern and E. B. Sonin, *ibid* **47**, 505 (1993).
- [20] Theoretical estimates are given by E. Simanek, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 14054 (1992). For experimental observations, see A. C. Mota, A. Pollini, P. Visani, K. A. Müller and J. G. Bednorz, Phys. Rev. B **36**, 4011 (1987), A. García, X. X. Zhang, A. M. Testa, D. Fiorani and J. Tejada, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter. **4**, 10341 (1992).
- [21] M. A. Kunchur, D. K. Kristen and J. M. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 998 (1993).

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Schematic picture of a vortex-impurity scattering process. See text for details.